

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 2, 4-9, 15, and 17-22 were pending in this application. All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young U.S. Patent No. 5,727,060 (hereinafter "Young"). Applicants have amended claims 2 and 15 to more particularly define the claimed invention. These amendments are fully supported by the specification, and do not add new matter. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

II. The § 102(b) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-9, 15, and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" (MPEP 2131). Young fails to teach each and every element of the independent claims.

In particular, Young fails to teach a program guide having a navigation cell selectable by a user to display program information associated with a designated group of time cells or channel cells that correspond to a navigation point, as specified by independent claims 2 and 15. In rejecting this subject matter in pending claims 2 and 15, the Examiner asserts, with reference to cells 26 in FIGS. 1-3 and 5-6 of Young, that "all the cells within the Grid are 'navigation cell[s]' because [a] user could navigate through those cells by cursor 32" (Office Action, page 3, lines 18-19). Applicants disagree. Specifically, Young does not disclose that any one of cells 26 is user-selectable to display program information associated with a designated group of time cells or channel cells, as required by applicants' claimed navigation cell.

Furthermore, in the rejections of claims 2 and 15, the Examiner attempts to compare applicants' navigation point to icon 46 in FIG. 5 of Young. In particular, the Examiner asserts that:

[I]con 46 of Fig. 5 [of Young] is a navigation point associated with a corresponding program information, i.e., a user[,] by selecting el. 46, the system causes the program guide [to] display a list of TV programs includes[sic] channel and time as well as title that matches the same vintage of a series of Lucy so that [the] user could navigate the list for selection; Col. 8, lines 25-36). (Office Action, page 4, lines 12-16)

Applicants disagree. Applicants' navigation point and Young's icon 46 refer to two very different concepts that the Examiner appears to be confusing. Regarding icon 46, Young states that it is an icon that is displayed in the guide to identify linked programs that are tagged for recording or that are recorded (Young, col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 10). In contrast, applicants' navigation point is a menu shortcut (see, e.g., paragraph [0058]) to which the program guide navigates in response to receiving a user selection of a navigation cell, and which corresponds to a designated group of time cells or channel cells. As explained in applicants' specification, a "Hot Picks" navigation point, for example, may be associated with a group of channel cells corresponding to a premium channel line-up. Similarly, a "What's On" navigation point may be associated with a group of time cells corresponding to a current time period. When the program guide is navigated to such a navigation point, program information associated with the designated group of channel or time cells is displayed in the program guide. Thus, applicants' claimed navigation point is a shortcut to which the guide navigates, whereas Young's icon 46 is not. Therefore, icon 46 of Young is not the same as the navigation point claimed by applicants.

For at least the above reasons, Young does not set forth each and every limitation of independent claims 2 and 15, as is required for a rejection under § 102(b). Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of amended independent claims 2 and 15. The § 102 rejection of claims 4-9, which depend from independent claim 2, and claims 17-22, which depend from independent claim 15, should also be withdrawn for the same reasons.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including

claims 2, 4-9, 15 and 17-22, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Hassan Albakri  
Limited Recognition No. L0013  
Attorney for Applicants  
Fish & Neave IP Group  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8704  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000